IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SOLANO & NAPA COUNTIES ELECTRICAL NO C 07-4111 VRW WORKERS HEALTH AND WELFARE TRUST FUND, et al, ORDER

Plaintiffs,

v

CAMERON ELECTRIC & LIGHTING DESIGN, a sole proprietorship; ZACHARY ALAN CAMERON, its owner; and CAMERON ELECTRIC d/b/a CAMERON ELECTRIC & LIGHTING DESIGN

Defendants.

Plaintiffs seek default judgment on grounds that defendants Cameron Electric & Lighting Design and Zachary Alan Cameron ("defendants") failed to contribute to multi-employer benefit plans as required by applicable collective bargaining agreements. Plaintiffs seek damages under 29 USC § 1132(g)(2). Doc #13 at 4-5. For reasons discussed below, plaintiffs' motion for default judgment is GRANTED.

#1. Defendants were served on August 21, 2007, but did not respond. Doc #4. On September 28, 2007, the clerk entered default. Doc #7. Plaintiffs filed a motion for default judgment and supporting papers on February 19, 2008. Doc ##12-16. Defendants were served by mail on the same day. Doc ##12-16. Defendants did not respond to the motion for default judgment.

On April 10, 2008, the court ordered defendants to show cause in writing by April 20, 2008, why default judgment should not be entered. Doc #18. Plaintiffs served the order to show cause on defendants by mail on April 18, 2008. Doc #19. Defendants have not responded to the order to show cause.

Plaintiffs seek damages of \$68,328.28 under 29 USC § 1132(g)(2), comprising \$54,288.92 in unpaid fringe benefit contributions, \$9,526.50 in liquidated damages and \$4,512.86 in attorney fees and costs. Having reviewed the complaint and the declaration in support of default judgment, Doc #14, the court determines that plaintiffs have made a sufficient showing to support the requested judgment.

In particular, the court notes that plaintiffs' fee and cost request is reasonable. Plaintiffs' counsel, Scott M De Nardo, bills plaintiffs \$235 per hour for his services. As of the time he wrote his declaration in support of fees, De Nardo had billed plaintiffs for 14.4 hours of work on this matter; he estimates that he spent an additional three hours in researching and drafting the supplemental declaration in support of attorney fees. Doc #20 at \$4. Thus, plaintiffs request \$4,089 in attorney fees.

Applying the principles set forth in In re HPL

Technologies, Inc, Securities Litigation, 366 F Supp 2d 912, 921-
922 (ND Cal 2005) (Walker, J), the court determines that
plaintiffs' fee request is reasonable. Under the 2008 Laffey
matrix (adjusted upward for the cost of living in the San Francisco
Bay area), an attorney with six years of experience, such as De
Nardo, Doc #20 at ¶5, would bill approximately \$279 per hour. See
United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia Laffey
Matrix 2003-2008 (http://www.usdoj.gov/usao/dc/Divisions/Civil_
Division/Laffey_Matrix_7.html); U S Office of Personnel Management
2008 Salary Tables (http://opm.gov/oca/08tables/). De Nardo's rate
of \$235 per hour is reasonable for an attorney of his experience
level working in San Francisco. In addition, the court finds that
spending 17.4 hours to draft a complaint for damages under 29 USC §
1132(g)(2) and prosecute a motion for default judgment is
reasonable, especially given that De Nardo's hourly rate is lower
than that suggested by the Laffey matrix. In addition, the request
for \$423.86 in costs (including the \$350 filing fee) is reasonable.

Accordingly, the clerk is DIRECTED to enter judgment against defendants Cameron Electric & Lighting Design and Zachary Alan Cameron in the amount of \$68,328.28.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

VAUGHN R WALKER

United States District Chief Judge